HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 200209086-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Ramanathan Kasiviswanathan et al

Confirmation No.: 4154

Application No.: 10/802,163

Examiner: Ojo O. Oyebisi

Filing Date: March 16, 2004

Group Art Unit: 3694

Title: A TRANSACTION SWITCH AND A METHOD OF USE THEREOF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Reply Brief with respect to the Examiner's Answer mailed on August 11, 2008 .

This Reply Brief is being filed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.193(b) within two months of the date of the Examiner's Answer.

(Note: Extensions of time are not allowed under 37 CFR 1.136(a))

(Note: Failure to file a Reply Brief will result in dismissal of the Appeal as to the claims made subject to an expressly stated new ground rejection.)

No fee is required for filing of this Reply Brief.

If any fees are required please charge Deposit Account 08-2025.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300.
Date of facsimile: October 6, 2008

Typed Name: Judy H. Chung

Signature:

Total number of pages: 7

Respectfully submitted,

Ramanathan Kasiviswanathan et al

By

Ashok K. Mannava

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No. : 45,301

Date : October 6, 2008

Telephone : (703) 652-3822

Rev 10/08 (ReplyBrf)

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Attorney Docket No.: 200209086-1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s):	Ramanathan Kasiviswanathan et al.	**Confirmation No.:**	4154
Serial No.:	10/802,163	**Examiner:**	Ojo O. Oyebisi
Filed:	March 16, 2004	**Group Art Unit:**	3694
Title:	A TRANSACTION SWITCH AND A METHOD OF USE THEREOF		

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF - PATENTS

Sir:

This is a Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed August 11, 2008.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 0 6 2008

This Reply Brief addresses the Examiner's remarks on pages 7-12 of the Examiner's Answer.

According to embodiments described in the Applicants specification, a switch is operable to perform composite and/or multi-host transactions. For example, the switch 202 includes modules for determining whether a received primary transaction is a composite or a multi-host transaction. The determination may be based on one or more of the payment type, transaction type, and response code from a host sending a response to the primary transaction. For example, based on one or more of the payment type, transaction type, and the response code, the analyzing module determines whether the transaction should be sent to a second host for processing. See paragraphs 13, 14 and 20-21.

Thus, there is a need to determine whether the specific transaction is of a type, such as a multi-host or composite, where the transaction should be sent to a second host. Conventional switches do not support composite transactions and are unable to determine whether a transaction is a composite transaction or a multi-host transaction.

Independent claims 1 and 18

Independent claims 1 and 18 recite:

> determining a need for transmitting the primary transaction request to another host.

On pages 7 and 8, the Examiner alleges this feature is taught by Ofir because Ofir discloses a protocol used to interconnect the host 36 and the service node 25b, and the host and service node are directly connected by the a private line. However, simply because Ofir

discloses a protocol used to interconnect a node and a host, does not require determining a need to transmit the request to another host. Ofir only discloses that there is a protocol for connecting a node and a host. This could be a hand-shaking procedure or some other procedure that provides for the communication between the node and the host. Nowhere does Ofir disclose that this protocol requires determining whether there is a need to transmit the request to another host.

Dependent claims 4 and 19

On page 8, the Examiner alleges that the service name in Ofir contains the address associated with a particular transaction type, and that Ofir determines the appropriate node to transmit the request based on the service name, and thus, Ofir discloses determining a need to transmit the request to another host based on transaction type.

The Applicants disagree because Ofir discloses the client node selects a route to forward the transaction based in part on the service name, link, capacity, configuration, and processor loading. See Ofir column 30, lines 9-24. However, Ofir does not determine a need to transmit to another host based on transaction type. Instead, Ofir only selects a route based on service name, which the Examiner equates to service type. Selecting a route is not the same as determining a need to transmit to another host, let alone determining a need to transmit to another host based on transaction type. In Ofir, this need determination is not performed. Instead, Ofir automatically assumes the request is to be sent to the service node, and the route is selected. Thus, Ofir fails to teach the claimed need determination based on transaction type.

Independent Claim 5

On page 9, the Examiner relies on FIG.5, element 510 "route simple request to nearest busy host" as the teaching in Ofir of the claimed plurality of hosts. However, claim 5 also recites a plurality of packets for transmission to the plurality of hosts based on transaction and payment type, and receiving responses at a switch from the plurality of hosts. The host of element 510 of FIG. 5 is described in column 14, lines 1-27 of Ofir. Clearly, Ofir only discloses sending a message to only a single host. Thus, Ofir fails to teach these features.

Dependent Claim 9

The Examiner does not address the Applicants arguments with respect to dependent claim 9, which are provided below.

Claim 9 is dependent on independent claim 5. The features of dependent claim 9 are similar to the features of claim 4 described above and not taught by Ofir. In particular claim 9 recites,

> receiving a secondary transaction containing a reference to the primary transaction request;
>
> retrieving a transaction history using the unique identifier; and
>
> transmitting a request to a host contained in the transaction history for reversing the primary transaction.

At least the secondary transaction and the request to a host contained in the transaction history for reversing the primary transaction are not taught by Ofir.

Independent claims 10 and 13

On page 11 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states, "If the information provided to the network 33 states the transaction is multi-host, composite or both, then inherently Ofir's terminal adapter would relay this information to the appropriate hosts."

However, Ofir fails to teach information identifying a transaction as multi-host, composite or both Also, Ofir fails to teach the network 33 determines whether the transaction is multi-host or composite, so Ofir fails to teach means for identifying a transaction as multi-host or both multi-host and composite.

Further, Ofir fails to teach a composite transaction comprised of a plurality of transactions, each to be transmitted to a different host, and the plurality of transactions have different payment types and transaction types.

Dependent Claims 12 and 17

Ofir fails to teach identifying the payment type, as recited in dependent claim 12. Ofir fails to teach a request for reversing a primary transaction, as recited in dependent claim 17. The Examiner alleges payment type is disclosed in FIG. 12A of Ofir. However, FIG. 12A discloses a transaction type rather than a payment type. Furthermore, the Examiner cannot equate the transaction type of FIG. 12A to be the claimed payment type, because both a payment type and a transaction type are recited in claim 12. The Examiner alleges reversing a primary transaction is shown in FIG. 10 of Ofir. However, FIG. 10 discloses using backups when a failure is detected, but fails to teach reversing a transaction.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 200209086-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/802,163

Conclusion

For at least the reasons given above and the reasons provided in the Appeal Brief, the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Ofir should be reversed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 6, 2008 By

Ashok K. Mannava
Registration No.: 45,301

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.
11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, VA 22030
(703) 652-3822
(703) 865-5150 (facsimile)